

1 G. HOPKINS GUY, III (SBN 124811)  
hopguy@orrick.com

2 KAI TSENG (SBN 193756)

3 ktseng@orrick.com

4 MICHAEL C. SPILLNER  
(SBN 205785)

5 mspillner@orrick.com

6 ORRICK, HERRINGTON &  
SUTCLIFFE LLP

7 1000 Marsh Road

8 Menlo Park, California 94025

9 Telephone: (650) 614-7400

10 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401

11 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

12 ACER AMERICA CORP. and  
13 GATEWAY, INC.

14 MARK C. SCARSI (SBN 183926)

15 mscarsi@milbank.com

16 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY &  
17 McCLOY LLP

18 601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor  
19 Los Angeles, California 90017-5735

20 Telephone: (213) 892-4000

21 Facsimile: (213) 629-5063

22 Attorneys for Plaintiff

23 APPLE INC.

24 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

25 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

26 ACER AMERICA CORP., APPLE INC.,  
27 DELL INC., and GATEWAY, INC.,

28 Plaintiffs,

v.

WI-LAN, INC.,

Defendant.

ARTHUR S. BEEMAN (SBN 237996)

asbeeman@jonesday.com

PAMELA K. FULMER (SBN 154736)

pkfulmer@jonesday.com

JONES DAY

555 California Street, 26th Floor

San Francisco, California 94104

Telephone: (415) 626-3939

Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

THOMAS R. JACKSON

(to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

trjackson@jonesday.com

DANIEL T. CONRAD

(to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

dtconrad@jonesday.com

JONES DAY

2727 North Harwood Street

Dallas, Texas 75201-1515

Telephone: (214) 220-3939

Facsimile: (214) 969-5100

Attorneys for Plaintiff

DELL INC.

ORIGINAL  
FILED

DEC 17 PM 4:27  
RICHARD W. WIEKING  
U.S. DISTRICT COURT  
N.D. CALIF.

JL

C08 05624

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR DECLARATORY  
JUDGMENT

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

1 Plaintiffs Acer America Corp. (“Acer America”), Apple Inc. (“Apple”), Dell Inc.  
2 (“Dell”), and Gateway, Inc. (“Gateway”) (collectively, “Plaintiffs”), for their Complaint against  
3 Wi-LAN, Inc. (“Wi-LAN”), hereby allege as follows:

#### 4 **NATURE OF THE ACTION**

5 1. This is an action for a declaratory judgment of non-infringement, invalidity, and  
6 unenforceability of United States Patent No. 6,549,759 (the “‘759 patent”) pursuant to the  
7 Declaratory Judgment Act, 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201-02, and the patent laws of the United States, 35  
8 U.S.C. § 100 *et seq.*, and for such other relief as the Court deems just and proper.

#### 9 **INTRADISTRICT ASSIGNMENT**

10 2. This action includes patent-based declaratory judgment claims arising in  
11 connection with conduct occurring in or directed to Santa Clara County. This action is related to  
12 another action pending in the San Jose Division, *Intel Corporation v. Wi-LAN, Inc.*, Case No.  
13 5:08-cv-04555-JW.

#### 14 **PARTIES**

15 3. Plaintiff Acer America is an entity organized and existing under the laws of  
16 California, with its principal place of business at 333 West San Carlos Street, Suite 1500, San  
17 Jose, California 95110.

18 4. Plaintiff Apple is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of  
19 California, with its principal place of business at 1 Infinite Loop, Cupertino, California 95014.

20 5. Plaintiff Dell is a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of  
21 Delaware and having its principal place of business at One Dell Way, Round Rock, Texas 78682.

22 6. Plaintiff Gateway is an entity organized and existing under the laws of Delaware,  
23 with its principal place of business at 7565 Irvine Center Drive, Irvine, California 92618.

24 7. On information and belief, defendant Wi-LAN, Inc., is a corporation organized  
25 and existing under the laws of Canada and having its principal place of business at 11 Holland  
26 Avenue, Suite 608, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada.

27 8. As alleged herein, Wi-LAN has engaged in various acts in and directed to  
28 California.

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5
- 6
- 7
- 8
- 9
- 10
- 11
- 12
- 13
- 14
- 15
- 16
- 17
- 18
- 19
- 20
- 21
- 22
- 23
- 24
- 25
- 26
- 27
- 28

- 2
- 3
- 4

5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12

13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19

## 20

21  
22  
23

## 24

## 25

26  
27

14. The Plaintiffs have not infringed and do not infringe, directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 patent.

15. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

16. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that the Plaintiffs may ascertain their rights regarding the ‘759 patent.

**COUNT II**

**(Declaration Of Invalidity Of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,759)**

17. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-16 as though fully set forth herein.

18. The '759 patent is invalid for failure to meet the conditions of patentability and/or otherwise to comply with one or more of 35 U.S.C. §§ 100 *et seq.*, 101, 102, 103, 112 and 132.

19. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

20. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that the Plaintiffs may ascertain their rights regarding the '759 patent.

**COUNT III**

**(Declaration Of Unenforceability Of U.S. Patent No. 6,549,759)**

21. The Plaintiffs repeat and reallege the allegations in paragraphs 1-20 as though fully set forth herein.

22. On information and belief, individuals subject to the duty of candor under 37 C.F.R. § 1.56 (“Applicants”) engaged in inequitable conduct by withholding or misstating material information with intent to deceive the United States Patent and Trademark Office (“USPTO”) in connection with prosecuting the ‘759 patent, rendering the ‘759 patent unenforceable.

23. On information and belief, during prosecution of the ‘759 patent, Applicants were aware of prior art that they knew was material to patentability, including prior public disclosures material to patentability that they deliberately failed properly to disclose to the USPTO with intent to deceive.

24. For example, on or around July 7, 2000, a document entitled “Media Access Control Layer Proposal for the 802.16.1 Air Interface Specification,” was submitted to the 802.16 MAC Subgroup by Glen Sater, of Motorola, and Kenneth L. Stanwood, of Ensemble Corporation. Kenneth L. Stanwood is a named inventor on the ‘759 patent.

25. Applicants' public disclosures, including those described above, were material to the patentability of the application that issued as the '759 patent. On information and belief, during prosecution of the application that issued as the '759 patent, with intent to deceive the USPTO, Applicants failed to disclose these public disclosures to the USPTO. Under Wi-LAN's improper and incorrect apparent interpretations of the '759 patent's claims, these disclosures constitute prior art that render the claims of the '759 patent invalid under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 and/or 103.

26. As a result of the acts described in the foregoing paragraphs, there exists a substantial controversy of sufficient immediacy and reality to warrant the issuance of a declaratory judgment.

27. A judicial declaration is necessary and appropriate so that the Plaintiffs may ascertain their rights regarding the '759 patent.

## PRAYER FOR RELIEF

**WHEREFORE**, the Plaintiffs respectfully request that judgment be entered in their favor and pray that the Court grant the following relief:

A. A declaration that each of the Plaintiffs has not infringed, either directly or indirectly, any valid and enforceable claim of the '759 patent;

B. A declaration that the claims of the '759 patent are invalid;

C. A declaration that the '759 patent is unenforceable;

D. An order declaring that each of the Plaintiffs is a prevailing party and that this is

1 an exceptional case, awarding each of the Plaintiffs its costs, expenses, disbursements, and  
2 reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules and  
3 common law; and


4 E. Such other and further relief as the Court may deem just and proper.

5 **JURY DEMAND**

6 The Plaintiffs hereby respectfully demand a trial by jury on all issues and claims so  
7 triable.

8  
9 Dated: December 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,


10 

11 G. Hopkins Guy, III  
12 Kai Tseng  
13 Michael C. Spillner  
14 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
15 1000 Marsh Road  
16 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
17 Telephone: (650) 614-7400  
18 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401

16 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
17 ACER AMERICA CORP. and GATEWAY, INC.

18  
19 Dated: December 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

20  
21   
22 Mark C. Scarsi  
23 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & McCLOY LLP  
24 601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor  
25 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5735  
26 Telephone: (213) 892-4000  
27 Facsimile: (213) 629-5063

25 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
26 APPLE INC.

1 an exceptional case, awarding each of the Plaintiffs its costs, expenses, disbursements, and  
2 reasonable attorney fees under 35 U.S.C. § 285 and all other applicable statutes, rules and  
3 common law; and

4 E. Such other and further relief as this Court may deem just and proper.

5 **JURY DEMAND**

6 The Plaintiffs hereby respectfully demand a trial by jury on all issues and claims so  
7 triable.

8  
9 Dated: December 17, 2008


Respectfully submitted,

10  
11 G. Hopkins Guy, III  
12 Kai Tseng  
13 Michael C. Spillner  
14 ORRICK, HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE LLP  
15 1000 Marsh Road  
16 Menlo Park, CA 94025  
17 Telephone: (650) 614-7400  
18 Facsimile: (650) 614-7401

19 Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
20 ACER AMERICA CORP. and GATEWAY, INC.

21 Dated: December 17, 2008


Respectfully submitted,

22   
23 Mark C. Scarsi  
24 MILBANK, TWEED, HADLEY & McCLOY LLP  
25 601 South Figueroa Street, 30th Floor  
26 Los Angeles, CA 90017-5735  
27 Telephone: (213) 892-4000  
28 Facsimile: (213) 629-5063

Attorneys for Plaintiffs  
APPLE INC.

1 Dated: December 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,

2 

3 Arthur S. Beeman  
4 Pamela K. Fulmer  
5 JONES DAY  
6 San Francisco Office  
7 555 California Street, 26th Floor  
8 San Francisco, CA 94104  
9 Telephone: (415) 626-3939  
10 Facsimile: (415) 875-5700

11 Thomas R. Jackson (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)  
12 Daniel T. Conrad (to be admitted *pro hac vice*)

13 JONES DAY  
14 2727 North Harwood Street  
15 Dallas, TX 75201-1515  
16 Telephone: (214) 220-3939  
17 Facsimile: (214) 969-5100

18 Attorneys for Plaintiff  
19 DELL INC.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28